

REMARKS

Claims 7 – 14 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application, and Claims 7 – 14 were previously withdrawn.

In the Office Action, Claims 1 – 6 were rejected.

In this Amendment, Claims 1 and 3 are amended, and Claims 4, 5, 7 – 14 are cancelled. No new matter has been introduced as a result of this Amendment.

Accordingly, Claims 1 – 3 and 6 remain at issue.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 112 Indefiniteness Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner states that the limitation “stylus” does not appear in the specification. In response, Applicant has amended Claim 1 to recite “a finger, a pen or the like thereon” in lieu of “a finger or a stylus.” This claim amendment finds support in the specification, on page 13, lines 10 and 11.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this claim rejection be withdrawn.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims 1-5

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sekiguchi* (U.S. Patent No. 6,771,327) in view of *Cropper* (U.S. Patent No. 6,623,608). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a display unit. The display unit comprises a display panel and a flexible touch panel.

Referring to Applicants' Figure 8 as an illustrative example, Applicants' claimed invention comprises a display unit which has a display panel 40 including a substrate 11 on which a plurality of display devices 19R, 19G and 10B are formed, which are protected by the protective film 11A formed directly on the substrate, and a flexible touch panel 30 which (a) is composed of plastic films 21 and 22, (b) is directly bonded to a whole face of the display panel 40 with an adhesive layer 30 in between, and (c) detects contact with a finger, a pen or the like

thereon. The adhesive layer 30 is in direct contact with both the protective film 11A and one of the plastic films 21.

This is clearly unlike *Sekiguchi* and *Cropper*, taken singly or combined with each other.

In *Sekiguchi*, the display panel 4 includes a first substrate 1 and a second substrate 6 with the liquid crystal layer 15, first electrodes 2, second electrodes 7, a reflector 9, color filters 9, 10 and 11, and a protective planarization layer 12 therebetween. Further, *Sekiguchi* discloses that the touch panel 3 includes an upper substrate 21 and a lower substrate 26 separated in the width direction by a gap provide therebetween by the sealing member 40 such that the upper electrode 22 is opposed to the lower electrode 27 and the gap is filled with the filling medium 41. Moreover, the first substrate 1 of the display panel 4 and the lower substrate 26 of the touch panel 3 are bonded by a double-sided adhesive layer 44.

That is, in *Sekiguchi*, the first glass substrate 1 of the display panel 4 is positioned between the adhesive layer 44 and liquid crystal layer 15, but is not formed directly on the substrate 6 as is the claimed protective film 11A.

The Examiner acknowledged that *Cropper* discloses that the OLED display panel 102 is formed on a film 110 on one side of a substrate 100 and a touch screen (panel) 104 is formed on film 112 on the other side of the substrate 100. Thus, *Cropper* fails to teach or suggest that the touch panel 104 is formed directly on the display panel 102.

As such, *Sekiguchi* and *Cropper*, taken singly or in combination with each other, fail to teach or suggest a display panel including a substrate on which a plurality of display devices is formed, a protective film formed directly on the substrate for protecting the plurality of display devices, a flexible touch panel composed of plastic films and directly bonded to a whole face of the display panel with an adhesive layer in between and in direct contact with both the protective film and one of the plastic films.

Thus, Claim 1 is patentable over *Sekiguchi* in view of *Cropper*, as are dependent Claims 2, 3 and 6, for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request that the claim rejections be withdrawn.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims 1-6

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sekiguchi* in view of *Siwinski* (U.S. Patent No. 6,814,642). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Siwinski states, in column 5, lines 7 -25, that (emphasis added):

“Referring to FIG. 8, a touch screen display generally designated 100 according to the present invention includes a *transparent sheet 102 having light emitting elements 52 of an electroluminescent display formed on one face of the substrate for emitting light through the substrate, in a bottom-emitting structure, and touch sensitive elements 14 of a touch screen formed on the other face of the transparent sheet 102*. The transparent sheet 102 is made of a transparent material, such as glass or plastic, and is thick enough to provide mechanical support for both the light emitting elements 52 and the touch sensitive elements 14. This improved display eliminates the need for a second substrate, and allows both the light emitting elements 52 of the image display and the touch sensitive elements 14 to be formed on the same substrate without interfering with each other. This reduces system cost, manufacturing cost, and system integration complexity. Various prior art touch screen technologies may be employed in the touch screen display 100 as described below.”

Thus, similarly to *Cropper* discussed above, *Siwinski* discloses that the light emitting elements 52 of an electroluminescent display (panel) are formed on one side of a transparent sheet 102 while touch sensitive elements (panel) 14 of a touch screen formed on the other face of the transparent sheet 102. Thus, *Siwinski* fails to teach or suggest that the touch panel 104 is formed directly on the display panel.

As such, *Sekiguchi* and *Siwinski*, taken singly or in combination with each other, fail to teach or suggest a display panel including a substrate on which a plurality of display devices is formed, a protective film formed directly on the substrate for protecting the plurality of display devices, a flexible touch panel composed of plastic films and directly bonded to a whole face of the display panel with an adhesive layer in between and in direct contact with both the protective film and one of the plastic films.

Thus, Claim 1 is patentable over *Sekiguchi* in view of *Siwinski*, as are dependent Claims 2, 3 and 6, for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request that the claim rejections be withdrawn.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that Claims 1 – 3 and 6 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Dec. 10, 2007

By: 

Kader Gacem
Registration No. 52,474
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000